

REMARKS

In response to the action, Applicants have filed a terminal disclaimer and cancelled claims 5 to 10 and 12. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

In response to the Examiner's request Applicants have cancelled claims 5 to 10 and 12. But because claim 1 represents a generic claim that includes claims 5 to 8 and 12 and the method claims (9 and 10) also include the compositional limitations, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement upon allowance of claim 1.


The action rejects claims 1 to 4 and 11 for obviousness-type double patenting in view of US. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0031789 (Liu et al.) in different combinations in a total of three separate rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections become moot in view of the enclosed terminal disclaimer.

The action rejects claims 1 to 4 as being obvious in view of EP 1229093 ('093). Specifically EP '093 discloses hydrogen peroxide, an abrasive, an organic ammonium salt and imidazole. Imine ( $C=NH$ ) and imine derivatives require a bivalent radical with a carbon to nitrogen double bond. Since imidazole is a tautomer that shares an active hydrogen atom between two nitrogen atoms, it lacks the bivalent radical and is not an imine derivative. Thus, since the '093 patent does not disclose the use of an imine derivative for facilitating barrier removal, Applicants respectfully submit that EP '093 does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the amended claims. If a telephone call would expedite matters, then please call me at 302-283-2136.

Respectfully submitted,

June 30, 2005  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Blake T. Biederman  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 34,124

Blake T. Biederman  
Patent Attorney  
1105 North Market Street  
Suite 1300  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
Tel. 302-283-2136